

the Spanish-Speaking community. Moreover, reallocate the resources provided to SER to local communities on the basis of the needs of the disadvantaged and the results that can be achieved on their behalf.

7. To foster the development of Spanish-Speaking leadership through executive exchange programs with other manpower agencies. To recruit some key staff with special executive development skills without regard to ethnic identification. To assist in executive search and recruitment activities for other public and private agencies. To carry out programs to broaden access to higher education.

THE DEVELOPMENT

In the Spring of 1965, job placement centers for the Spanish-Speaking were operated in Houston and Corpus Christi by the League of United Latin American Citizens. Under the banner of "Jobs for Progress", the centers were funded and staffed exclusively by Spanish-Speaking volunteers.

Based on the lessons learned, the two national organizations, LULAC and the American GI Forum, joined to form "Jobs for Progress, Inc." to "... eliminate poverty in the Southwest—with special attention to the culturally different." The large scale program to tap the manpower resources of the Spanish-Speaking community was given the name "to be" in Spanish—Operation "SER".

On June 10, 1966, Secretary of Labor Wilard Wirtz and OEO Director Sargent Shriver announced the joint funding of Operation SER's Regional Office, and on October 3, George J. Roybal was installed as SER's Executive Director with a small staff in Albuquerque, and the Skills Bank started placing people in non-traditional jobs.

By August 1968, the result of two year's work began to materialize. Convinced that it was moving in the right direction, SER forged ahead, implementing new ideas to reach the Spanish-Speaking, making Manpower programs available to them for the first time. As of January 1970, SER had in operation 23 programs.

The Regional Skills Bank had coordinated the activities of 5 State Offices and 21 local offices. Together, the combined Skills Banks had registered over 50,000 Spanish-Speaking Americans throughout the 5 Southwestern States and had placed more than 12,000 persons in non-traditional employment. The SER Research and Data Processing Department collected and tabulated valuable data utilized by SER in future Manpower programming.

The total impact of SER on the Spanish-Speaking community cannot be ascertained at this time. Manpower accomplishments can be cited, but these were not the only services effected by SER. Employment-policy changes influenced by SER are too recent to be noticeable. Yet, State operating agencies are cognizant of the fact that SER has reached thousands of disadvantaged Spanish-Speaking Americans; people formerly not serviced by any State employment or Manpower agency.

THE PROBLEM

The Spanish-Speaking in the nation is worse off in every respect than all other Americans. They are poorer, their housing is more crowded and more dilapidated, their

unemployment rate is higher, and their educational level is lower (two years below non-white, four below Anglo).

CULTURAL DIFFERENCE

Spanish-Speaking Americans are unique among peoples who make up our nation. They did not "arrive" to colonize. They were already here when our Southwestern boundaries grew around them and the Anglo migration came to overwhelm them. Conquering the frontier to establish civilization really meant conquering the Mexican to establish Anglo institutions, in which the Mexican had little say, and which had little inclination to include him.

With language, religion and customs at odds with the dominant society, the Mexican remained culturally and economically isolated in the midst of increasing prosperity. The Spanish-Speaking of today is first and foremost a committed and loyal American, but his desperate struggle to educate himself, and to find a better job, is a constant reminder of his cultural disadvantage. Attitudes rooted in the nineteenth century persist and perpetuate a dilemma which is not easily resolved, and our dynamic economic growth is only leaving the Spanish-Speaking further behind.

A NEW APPROACH

SER was designed by the major Spanish-Speaking organizations to break down cultural and economic barriers to full employment for the Spanish-Speaking of the nation by involving the Spanish-Speaking themselves in the effort. SER is staffed exclusively with bilingual, bicultural personnel who are not only well qualified in their respective specialties, but whose experience and motivation make them cognizant and adept at dealing with cultural difference. By developing and administering manpower programs in this manner, effective gains are already being made.

RCA IS PROUD TO TRADE WITH THE ENEMY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Radio Corporation of America Global Communications, Inc. is so proud of its Communist China satellite sale that as a tax deduction it is running a full page slick Chinese signature on the sale contract.

It is unfortunate that pictures cannot be reproduced in the Record.

Supposedly, the new Red China RCA satellite station will provide a link for live TV broadcasts between the two countries. If the Red Chinese controlled TV is as unrepresentative of the Chinese people as is the U.S. controlled TV, there will be little gained in international understanding. RCA is proud to trade with the enemy.

The ad follows:

[From Business Week, April 8, 1972]

THESE TWO SIGNATURES OPENED THE WAY FOR REGULAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

They are on a contract signed in Peking on January 22, 1972 between RCA Global Communications, Inc. and The China National Machinery Import and Export Corporation.

It is a contract to sell The People's Republic of China their first satellite earth station.

It is going to put a fourth of the world's people in regular touch with the rest of the world by satellite for the first time ever.

The RCA earth station will provide a link for live television broadcasts between the two countries, as well as voice, teleprinter, and facsimile communications.

Only with modern electronic communications can fear and isolation gradually give way to cooperation, understanding and friendship.

In 1919, our company was formed to provide international communications for another of the world's great nations. The communication was a simple wireless telegraph. The nation was The United States of America.

THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 27th anniversary of the death of perhaps our country's most outstanding President. Twenty-seven years ago today Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 32d President of the United States died at Warm Springs, Ga.

I need not convince you of this man's greatness. We are all already well aware of this fact. The man who has come lovingly to be known as F. D. R. provided this country with the strong, unflinching leadership it so desperately needed at two of its lowest moments in history.

Franklin Roosevelt assumed office as President in 1932, and with boldness and initiative brought a crippled Nation to its feet. Again, when several years later the Axis Powers threatened destruction of the free world, F. D. R. firmly grasped the reins and instilled the confidence and courage which ultimately led us to final security.

On this day I would ask that we all spend a moment in quiet reflection on the loss we all endured by the death of this outstanding individual who so profoundly influenced for the better not only this country, but the entire world. Let us pay tribute to a great man—a good man.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 13, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph F. Thornington, D.D., Ph. D., pastor emeritus of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Md., and an honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, let the radiance of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Grant a special blessing to leaders of the American Republics now assembled

in Washington that they be inspired to propose measures, not only providing higher standards of living, education, and work, but also guarantees for the security of their peoples in their homes and nations, when faced with outside aggression or domestic subversion.

We pray that, as a result of brotherly love and cooperation, nobility of purpose may be transformed into a partnership of fruitful action.

At the same time, may all citizens, who cherish freedom and the blessings of good government, display respect for the rights of their neighbors and a sense of responsibility for family life, two virtues essential to progress and friendship in national and international relationships.

We implore these divine graces through the love and favor of the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1338. An act to authorize the government of the District of Columbia to fix certain fees;

S. 1363. An act to revise and modernize procedures relating to licensing by the District of Columbia of persons engaged in certain occupations, professions, businesses, trades, and callings, and for other purposes;

S. 1819. An act to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the act; and

S. 2209. An act relating to crime and law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2770) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BAYH, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BAKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the rest of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the distinguished minority leader, we have completed the legislative program

for this week, except for the ceremonies attending Pan American Day which we will have in just a few minutes.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar, to be followed by 11 suspensions:

House Concurrent Resolution 471, relief from restrictions on Soviet Jews; H.R. 3544, changing the bracket tax on large cigars to an ad valorem tax;

H.R. 13753, wage adjustments for pre-vailing rate employees;

H.R. 13025, use of real property for wildlife conservation;

H.R. 13752, licensing of thermoelectric generating plants;

H.R. 13435, Upper Colorado River Basin;

H.R. 13434, Missouri River Basin;

S. 978, University of Utah land conveyance;

H.R. 11839, Gulf Islands National Seashore;

H.R. 1462, Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, Hawaii; and

H.R. 11774, Honokohau National Historic Landmark, Hawaii.

For Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar and the consideration of H.R. 45, Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, the program is as follows:

H.R. 10488, public buildings and grounds amendments, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 13591, National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 12202, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 14108, the National Science Foundation authorization, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 13034, the Fire Research and Safety Act authorization, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 14070, the NASA authorization, subject to a rule being granted.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business scheduled under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE HONORABLE DANTE B. FASCELL AND REVER- END FATHER JOSEPH F. THORNING ON PAN AMERICAN DAY

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full minute, but I simply want to take this time so as to congratulate and commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for the fine work he does each year on Pan American Day, and also those associated with him in this effort.

All of us appreciate the vital importance of our sister republics to the south of us.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to say a word about Father Thorning, who today for the 28th time gave the prayer at the opening of our session. Father Thorning has become an institution here, and we welcome him back.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order previously agreed to providing for the conduct of Pan American Day be altered so as to permit the presentation of 1-minute speeches first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE REVEREND FATHER JOSEPH F. THORNING

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today, Pan American Day, the prayer was offered by Father Joseph F. Thorning for the 28th consecutive year. Father Thorning, affectionately titled "the Padre of the Americas" by Senator MANSFIELD when he was a Member of the House, is a native of my State, Wisconsin. Following his graduation from St. Rose of Lima Grade School and Marquette Academy in Milwaukee, also my alma mater, he studied at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass., the St. Louis University, Georgetown University, Catholic University of America, and Oxford, England.

He has served as dean of the graduate school, Georgetown University; as chairman of the department of social history at Mount St. Mary's Major Seminary and College, Emmitsburg, Md., and is an honorary professor of the University of Santo Domingo and the Catholic University of Chile.

Father Thorning is associate editor of World Affairs, and has worked long and diligently for the cause of inter-American understanding. We hope Father Thorning will continue his efforts on be-

half of progress in the Western Hemisphere and that he will be with us on Pan American Day for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to join with our distinguished majority leader this morning in commending our colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for his efforts in promoting better understanding in the Western Hemisphere with our sister nations to the south.

THE NEWS MEDIA IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the news coverage of the Vietnam war has really brought the fighting right into our living rooms. In a way this is good because it has served to keep the American people informed, but it has also been bad from the standpoint of preventing our brave servicemen from fulfilling their assigned missions at certain times.

I personally feel that if news media personnel cause unnecessary problems for our commanders in the field and endanger the lives of our servicemen, we should institute restrictions as was done during World War II.

We have had evidence in recent days of just such an incident involving Lt. Col. Frederick P. Mitchell who was hampered by the news media in the performance of his duties. Lieutenant Colonel Mitchell certainly should not be reprimanded by the military for his statement to the press, nor should the news media be allowed to interfere with U.S. military operations when such interference endangers the lives of the servicemen or adversely affects the morale of the men.

OVERWITHHOLDING FROM INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYERS

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to learn today that the Federal Government is overwithholding between \$6 billion to \$8 billion from individual taxpayers in families with one worker. This cruel policy results from recommendations made to the Congress by Treasury officials last year—to correct a slight underwithholding in 1971. The result has been to wash out the benefits of increased exemptions and increased minimum tax deductions in last year's tax legislation.

In addition, it has provided the Federal Government with billions of dollars of interest-free use of taxpayer moneys. When corporations claim refunds of taxes paid to the Federal Government—at a rate which may reach \$5 billion this year—they usually collect interest from the Federal Government; their tax deposit is usually treated as a loan.

When the individual taxpayer is overwithheld—under this present plan—the Government takes his money and uses it

interest-free. As far as the average taxpayer is concerned, the system is absolutely cruel and unfair.

There is overwithholding today in every family where there is only one worker; the withholding schedules are based upon more than one worker in each family.

Every single taxpayer and every taxpayer in a one-worker family is overwithheld and should file a W-4 form with his employer on the basis of at least one additional exemption.

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 of this year, in an address in observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, I pointed out that in spite of the oppressive nature of the Soviet Union's stranglehold over the Ukraine, the spirit of freedom continues to flourish unabated in the hearts of the Ukrainian people.

Already the Soviets have proven once again the truth of these words. The recent arrest of some 13 Ukrainians in the cities of Kiev and Lvov for trying to exercise their rights as human beings and for engaging in activities native to their Ukrainian culture is just one more proof that the Soviet leaders still deeply fear the effects of liberty on people living under Communist domination, just as they did in 1968 with the people of Czechoslovakia.

The persons arrested—including Vyacheslav Chornovil, a journalist who was first jailed in 1967 for having prepared an account of political trials in the Ukraine, plus two distinguished literary critics, Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dzyuba—have given fresh and eloquent proof to the whole world that in spite of any consequences that may threaten them, the brave, freedom loving Ukrainian people will indeed continue their long struggle for liberty in their homeland.

It is not now known just what has happened to those who were arrested. Are they alive? Will they ever be tried? Even if the answer to both questions is "yes," we still know the kind of justice is that is customarily handed out by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply believe that we here in the United States, as still the leader of the free world, have a solemn duty to raise our official voice in protest to this most recent and most flagrant violation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to which the U.S.S.R. was itself a signatory. And here in this House it is likewise a duty for those of us who feel deeply on such matters to lead public opinion in voicing outrage at this and other such incidents.

Therefore, I join those who are urging the United Nations to conduct a full and immediate investigation of this terrorism that has been practiced by the Communists against the people of the Ukraine and I urge my colleagues and my fellow Americans to join in this earnest plea.

WHOLESALE PRICES SLOW DOWN AS FOOD PRICES DECLINE

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, March was a month which produced some encouraging developments in the Nation's anti-inflation effort. The March wholesale price index recently released by the Department of Labor shows a small, one-tenth of 1 percent increase on both seasonally adjusted and unadjusted bases.

The best news to come out of the March index is that wholesale food prices declined substantially. Farm products showed an average decrease of 1.3 percent seasonally adjusted, reflecting lower livestock and fresh produce prices. Fresh and processed consumer foods declined seven-tenths of 1 percent. This encouraging performance by wholesale food prices suggests that consumers should soon see prices decline at their grocery stores.

Industrial commodities also slowed their rate of advance in March, rising three-tenths of 1 percent after larger increases in each of the previous 2 months. We therefore have further reason to expect moderation in the price behavior of consumer goods as a result of these developments.

In the 7 months since the President announced his new economic program, the wholesale price index has risen 2.2 percent, compared with the nearly 3 percent advance over the previous 7-month period. This is evidence that the administration's anti-inflation program is successfully restraining price increase pressures. This progress also augurs well for the future, as reduced inflation at the wholesale level now is translated into reduced consumer price inflation later on.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 10488 UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Friday, April 14, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 10488.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE 82D ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNION OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution—House Resolution 923—and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 923

Whereas April 14, 1972, will mark the eighty-second anniversary of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States;

Whereas the continued hemispheric solidarity is essential to the cause of progress and freedom for all citizens of this hemisphere; and

Whereas in unity there is real promise of

accelerated progress in social and political reform and economic growth in the countries of our home hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in honor of the founding of the Pan American Union, the House of Representatives of the United States of America extends greetings to the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere and to all citizens of those Republics, with the fervent hope that new thresholds of good will, stability, and prosperity are being crossed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, before making my own statement, I would like to take a moment to recognize and again welcome to this Chamber one of America's most distinguished clergymen, the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning. Father Thorning, who is an associate editor of World Affairs, today delivered for the 28th consecutive year the invocation to the House of Representatives celebration of the cause of Inter-American friendship and cooperation. Long before ecumenism became as popular as it is today, Dr. Thorning, a former dean of the graduate school of Georgetown University, was in the forefront of those urging closer unity and cooperation among religious groups. Moreover, he was an apostle of interracial understanding before that cause was widely recognized. In addition to his many honors as a religious leader and humanitarian, Father Thorning enjoys a reputation as a distinguished scholar of international relations and hemisphere affairs. His best selling biography entitled "Miranda: World Citizen" and published by the University of Florida Press, is considered by many scholars to be the definitive work on Don Francisco de Miranda of Venezuela, the forerunner of Latin American freedom and independence.

I know that all of my distinguished colleagues will join me in the hope that Father Thorning will be with us on this important day for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate Pan American Day. We do so because 82 years ago men of vision and foresight, from both the Americas, realized that through cooperation and friendship it would be easier to achieve the kind of world they sought, and we still seek. In 1890, these men decided that a formal structure, a Union of American Republics, could well serve as a catalyst to a better and more peaceful hemisphere. In the intervening years, the world's oldest regional organization has many times proven its worth as a servant of peace and a promoter of international good will and understanding. From its small beginnings, it has grown into the thriving, vigorous, and multifaceted Organization of American States.

But Pan American Day marks more than just the anniversary of a great institution, it celebrates a much wider and deeper commitment by the peoples of this hemisphere to work together from their common heritage of political free-

dom toward a better future, marked by liberty and economic and social justice.

The OAS itself is the symbol of that commitment, but it is only one part, though an extremely important one, of the vast religious, intellectual, cultural, economic, and political ties that bind together the peoples of our respective nations.

It is with these numerous and complex ties in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to take this occasion on Pan American Day to extend best wishes to the distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, to the dozens of delegates to the Second General Assembly of the OAS now meeting in Washington, and to all those who work for a better hemisphere, not only in the OAS, but in other international organizations, in our national governments, and in business and labor. It is all these thousands of people who really are the inter-American system, and it is their work and their sacrifices that we salute today.

Besides being an occasion for celebration, Pan American Day provides an appropriate opportunity to reflect on the present state of U.S. relations with our hemisphere neighbors. In attempting to assess what is in reality a dynamic and complex situation, it is difficult at best to perceive the long term trends of where we have been and where we may be going. But, despite this obvious risk and because of the deep interest in Latin America here in the Congress, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss some of my impressions of U.S.-hemisphere relations.

Last year, on Pan American Day, I characterized Latin America as being in a period of great transition. That is, if anything, truer today than it was then. It will remain the dominant characteristic of most of the countries for a very long time. Because this fact underlies the turmoil which so often affects our relations with each of these countries and disturbs many of us here in this Chamber, it might be useful to repeat some of the statistics which indicate the vast pressures which so often boil over into headlines.

First, the population is growing at almost 3 percent annually but, at the same time, the segment of the economically active population is not growing as rapidly.

Moreover, the population is rushing from the countryside to cities at a rate unparalleled in human history. The average annual increase in the nonagricultural labor force was at an astounding rate of 3.5 percent annually from 1950 to 1965. What has happened then is that tens of millions who could find no productive work in the country have moved to the cities where for many the search for work has also proved fruitless. The result has been vast rings of slums around the cities filled with idle millions. It has been estimated that 6 percent of the people of Latin America do not share in any meaningful way in the economic life of their homelands. As inadequate a tool as income statistics can be, it is shocking to think that these 60 percent

have an average per capita income of only about \$110. Even including the "wealthier" 40 percent of Latin America's population, the average per capita income in 19 Latin American nations in 1969 was only \$470 compared with \$4,584 for the United States.

These statistics and the underlying human reality are at once both the result of underdevelopment and in some measure a further cause of continuing underdevelopment. It is the vast disparity between our way of life and that of our 270 million neighbors which conditions many of the problems we have with nations of the hemisphere.

In recognizing this situation and our common obligation within the Inter-American system President John Kennedy proposed and hemisphere nations approved an "Alliance for Progress" to try and close the gap between rich and poor. That objective has not been achieved. It may not be achieved for a very long time—but the Alliance has not failed. It has helped to unleash tremendous forces of change—forces whose enormity and scope we frankly had not even imagined and which we may never fully understand. Those forces, in turn, have helped bring to all of Latin America a new awareness of the need to change the old order; to replace the old, stagnant, tripartite oligarchy; to more fully and fairly share the benefits of political liberty and economic well being.

Accompanying these new aspirations has been an awakening social conscience and new leaders desiring change—leaders with whom we may often disagree and whose methods we may not always approve, but leaders who do hold out a hope for a better future for the people of the Caribbean and Latin America.

Where is the United States in all of this? Just where you might expect to find us—right in the middle—where I, for one, think we must be.

As I see it, the United States basically has two sets of problems with respect to Latin America. Both sets stem from the same source—the vast changes engulfing the developing nations of the hemisphere. First, there are problems which result from what the Latins themselves believe must be done. They have different attitudes toward foreign investment, toward trade, toward the importance of the environment, toward the role of the democratic process.

The second set of problems results not from their own response to their problems but from how they view our response. This is evidenced by concern over our trade restrictions, our monetary policies, the level of aid we furnish, the way we furnish it.

For the most part, the problems embraced by these two general categories result from genuine and legitimate difference of opinion which can be resolved by men of good will. But all too often their substance is obscured by strident political rhetoric on one side or another. Such shortsightedness can only delay urgent solutions and further inhibit development already too long delayed.

There is, of course, a third kind of

problem—such as Cuba—the kind of problem which cannot be solved because of a total unwillingness to compromise—a willful desire to prolong a problem and to inflame it if possible. Fortunately, while Cuba is a major problem, it is an isolated one. We can be thankful that despite very serious problems with other countries, including Chile, thus far it appears that solutions are still possible—that there still is a reservoir of good will.

In general, then, it seems to me that despite enormous difficulties and the continuing threat that any number of problems might cause a deterioration in our hemisphere relations, the inter-American system remains sound and our relations with almost all hemisphere countries reasonably good. Evidence of this is the general cooperation Latin America has displayed toward our own efforts to put our economic house in order. In addition, steps have been taken by a number of countries, Brazil and Mexico especially to reach mutually acceptable accommodations on a number of outstanding issues.

Having said all of this, I do not want to leave the impression that all is rosy and bright. Far from it. The problems are too large and our knowledge of what to do too scarce to inspire more than a little optimism. Moreover, the United States itself is failing to take the kind of long-term positive approach needed to insure good hemisphere relations throughout the 1970's by dealing in advance with the issues raised by the various problems arising out of the vast changes sweeping the hemisphere. For 3 years now, I have been calling for the implementation of such a positive hemisphere policy. I agree with those who say that now is the time for the United States to articulate a well defined and positive policy toward Latin America. As some have suggested no policy may be a policy—but it is not, I submit, an adequate policy, particularly since the Latins themselves have not been able to clearly identify U.S. policy.

For 80 years, through the OAS, the United States had a positive policy toward our hemisphere neighbors. We strengthened our commitment to such a policy in the Alliance for Progress but for the last 3 years, our policies have steadily lost vigor and increasingly drifted from one crisis to another. Clearly, the policies of the past must be updated; their direction and thrust constantly adjusted to new emerging realities; but just as surely they can never have impact if they have no momentum. I hope President Nixon will heed Gallo Plaza's call and apply to relations with our neighbors the direction, resourcefulness, and imagination he has used so effectively in dealing with our antagonists.

As I have stated on numerous occasions, the future of Latin America cannot be determined in Washington. What happens in the rest of the hemisphere really will depend on what the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean themselves choose to do or not to do. But there is much the United States can and should do to assist in the gigantic task of hemispheric development if the revolution in Latin America is to be a peace-

ful one and if in the future we desire to maintain close and friendly ties.

First, the foremost, I hope that the administration will, at the very least, take the first necessary steps toward carrying out its promise to the hemisphere of preferential tariff treatment for goods from the developing countries. Surely it is time to begin what may be a long and arduous effort to fulfill those promises to the hemisphere nations which have a deficit in their trade balance with us. Our neighbors too must be able to judge our performance as a nation on our deeds and not just on our words however sincere.

Second, as the forces of economic nationalism steadily gain strength in the hemisphere, the United States must take steps to clarify our position on our policies bilaterally and in international financial institutions on questions relating to expropriation of American businesses. We must make it clear to our neighbors that while we will act to uphold international standards and to protect the legitimate rights of our citizens, we will not react unwillingly—that we will not do so precipitously without full consideration of the facts of each individual case. We must assure our friends that while we will seek justice, we wish no harm to others and that we will make every effort to resolve economic disputes through negotiations and good will.

But, Mr. Speaker, short-term reassurances about our current policy on expropriation will not be enough.

As far as the hemisphere is concerned, the 1970's and 1980's increasingly will be marked by a series of serious economic problems. These problems can all too easily become political clashes if the current void in long-term international economic policy is allowed to continue. It is not enough to rely on the strength and energy of a dynamic Secretary of the Treasury. What is needed is a thorough restructuring of our own Government's international economic policy making machinery to insure that authority and imagination are combined in a new structure to create policies that will shape solutions to emerging problems before they become political crises between countries. Our current structure sees authority and responsibility divided amongst dozens of various departments, agencies, and boards. Even within the White House, overseas foreign policy decisionmaking power seems fragmented. The Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Council on International Economic Policy, the National Security Council, and the Council of Economic Advisers all bear major responsibility for various aspects of international economic policy. Below the White House, the Treasury, State, Agriculture, and Commerce Departments also have major overlapping responsibilities. Is it any wonder that we seem to have either no policy or two, three, or five policies?

Mr. Speaker, in addition to restructuring our own governmental lines of authority on overseas economic policy, the U.S. business community itself must re-

examine its own objectives and methods of operations in order to adjust to the new emerging political, economic and social realities in this hemisphere and throughout the developing world. The Council of the Americas and other business groups have begun this task. The Senate's forthcoming look at the role of multinational corporations will help. But small separate efforts are again not enough. The pace of events is swift and the issues difficult. I, therefore, urge the President to convene a White House Conference on Overseas Activities of U.S. Business to bring to focus the attention and abilities of our own private sector on how we can best meet the new emerging economic issues which will play such a large role in international relations during the last quarter of this century.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I want to share with my colleagues one other misgiving which I have regarding our present hemisphere policies. That concern is about what I perceive as a lack of a strong cohesive policy for the Caribbean area.

The islands of this sea, and the nations surrounding it, exclusive of the United States, have a population of some 200 million. It is a diverse area embracing the hemisphere's poorest nation and Latin America's richest but one whose potential as a market and as an economic unit has hardly been explored. Complicating the picture for the United States is the presence of Communist Cuba and the accompanying Soviet naval penetration of the area. But this is just another reason why I believe that the time has come for the United States to extend its hand in a new positive way toward our Caribbean friends.

Mr. Speaker, the steps which I have recommended cannot solve all our problems with the hemisphere. They are not designed to do so but they are positive concrete steps toward again bringing to our inter-American system a new sense of common purpose aimed at allowing every citizen of our hemisphere to live his or her life to the fullest measure of their potential.

On this Pan American Day, 1972, it is appropriate that we here in the United States rededicate ourselves to the inter-American system and consider, as the Alliance for Progress intended, how we need to change our perceptions and policies to build the kind of hemisphere community we all seek.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 82d anniversary of the founding of our inter-American system. On April 14, 1890, the First International Conference of American States established the International Union of American Republics and thus marked the beginning of continental solidarity and friendship.

This inter-American system, known today as the Organization of American States, is the oldest and most enduring of U.S. multilateral commitments. From early days in our history, we have recog-

nized the importance of Latin America and its special relationship to us.

The OAS charter forms the basis for this inter-American spirit, placing emphasis on the economic and social development of the hemisphere, and expressing basic principles and desirable goals to implement dynamic economic development and expanded educational and social opportunities. Development goals include a self-sustained increase in per capita national product; expansion of exports and the promotion of private initiative and investment; accelerated and expanded industrialization; reduction of illiteracy; adequate housing and improved health and nutrition standards.

To further the goal of economic collaboration, the Alliance for Progress came into being—a vast cooperative effort unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose to satisfy the basic needs of the American peoples for homes, work and land, health and schools. In August 1961, the Economic Ministers of the American Republics—with the exception of Cuba—signed the Charter of Punta del Este. This charter embodies the multilateral approach to spur economic development and reform prevailing economic and social structures, through self-help efforts on the part of Latin American participants, supplemented by U.S. assistance. Thus work has been undertaken and progress achieved in the areas of tax reform, land reform, education, and health.

The task remains enormous, because for a host of reasons—historical, geographical, political, and economic—most of Latin America suffers from crippling poverty, illiteracy, and disease. At the same time, population growth is outpacing the development of economic resources.

Capitalizing on poverty, illiteracy, and disease is the ever-present Communist threat—ready to exploit discontent and frustration resulting from the slowness of economic reform. International communism has always sought to establish a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere and thence to infiltrate the rest of the continent and destroy this great inter-American system.

The Communist-captured Cuban revolution represents a pattern of revolution which the Communists would like to spread throughout the less developed world. In January 1962, to meet this Communist threat, the OAS applied the Rio Treaty to the case of Cuba because the Castro government had officially adopted Marxist-Leninist ideology. This Eighth Meeting of Consultation found that such adherence to Communist doctrine was incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system. As a result, Cuba was excluded from participation in the inter-American system. In July 1964, because of Cuba's export of revolution to Venezuela, the Ninth Meeting of Consultation decided that diplomatic and trade relations between Cuba and other American nations be severed.

Nevertheless, export of revolution, which has been one of the major hallmarks of Fidel Castro's government, continues. The Cuban leader continues

to advocate violent revolution and has volunteered Cuban resources to promote continental revolution through armed struggle. Castro supported the Che Guevara insurgency in the Bolivian highlands; endorsed the terror tactics of the Rebel Armed Forces in Guatemala, the group responsible for the assassination of U.S. Ambassador John Gordon Mein; and now is supporting urban insurgency in Latin America. Cuba recently republished the Mini-manual of the Urban Guerrilla and distributed it throughout the hemisphere. Cuba continues to train guerrilla leaders—in sabotage, urban terrorism, kidnapping, and bombing. In his speeches, Castro has said that Cuba will continue to support revolutionary movements in Latin America and that he has no desire to rejoin the inter-American community. With Chile experimenting with socialist revolution, it is now even more imperative that we take steps to counteract the Communist threat.

The only hope of countering the appeals of communism in the hemisphere is to improve the quality of life. For people who have proper housing, schools, and jobs will not look for radical solutions.

The Alliance for Progress was a vast cooperative effort between the peoples of the hemisphere to satisfy the basic needs of the people for homes, work, land, health and schools. Progress in these areas has taken place, but much remains to be done in order to insure against a Communist takeover. We must rekindle these efforts and for this reason I have participated in conferences dealing with these economic and social problems and supported housing programs in Latin America. There is no doubt that the improvement of life in the Americas is the best investment that we could make toward saving these countries from a Communist takeover.

It is appropriate that as we mark another anniversary of Pan American Day, that we rededicate our efforts to furthering the peace, prosperity, and freedom of the Western Hemisphere, and join with our friends in Latin America in reaffirming our dedication to hemispheric solidarity and the continued progress of the inter-American system.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished minority leader on the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, who has given a great deal of leadership and time to this problem, such time as he may consume.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in welcoming once again to this Chamber a distinguished American, the Reverend Joseph Thornington, who once again is with us on Pan American Day. Dr. Thornington has received wide acclaim as an outstanding religious leader, a scholar humanitarian, and author. He has contributed enormously to the improvement of relations among the peoples of the American republics. He is indeed a citizen of the hemisphere.

I would like to join, too, in acknowledging the work of the second regular General Assembly of the Organization of American States and its distinguished

Secretary General, Galo Plaza. I wish them well in the important activities which engage them here in Washington on this very day.

It is with considerable pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I join Mr. FASCELL and my other colleagues today on the occasion of the 82d anniversary of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States.

Pan American Day has long symbolized the community of interests among all the peoples of the Americas. It has been observed traditionally as an occasion to renew verbally the commitment of our country to continuing unity and cooperation among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. This particular anniversary is certainly an appropriate time to reflect on the history of our relations with the other Republics of the hemisphere. At the same time, it is an equally appropriate time for us in the Congress to examine and evaluate new trends in our relations with our Latin American neighbors, and to look toward the future with a critical eye, assessing with great care current policies and practices of our Government.

Such an assessment is essential. Inter-American cooperation is vital to the overall interests of the United States and the hemisphere as a whole. Hemispheric unity is neither an anachronism nor is it a vacuous slogan as some would claim. Rather, it is based on a combination of very tangible mutual interests which include historical, humanitarian, social, economic, and security considerations.

It is generally recognized that relations between the United States and Latin America are currently going through a very difficult period of transition. What some people fail to recognize is that this transition—painful though it sometimes may be—is in many ways a very healthy development. More and more, responsible individuals in this country and in Latin America recognize that substantial adjustments must be made in the traditional patterns of hemispheric interaction. There is growing recognition that Latin Americans themselves can and should assume responsibility for major economic and political decisions that affect them directly. Inter-American relations cannot be unilateral in either design or in practice. Therefore, in analyzing the past and in making plans for the future, we must call upon our South American partners for their advice as to how we in the United States can improve our policies, our communications, and the nature of our relations with our hemispheric neighbors.

Within this framework of ongoing intergovernmental consultation, there are certain areas that merit our special attention. Human development, economic development, and the many faces of economic nationalism are all issues that we in the United States must face squarely and realistically in concert with our neighbors. We must recognize the legitimate apprehensions, as well as the economic problems and domestic pressures within Latin America that sometimes give rise to seemingly extreme actions on the part of our southern neighbors. Above all, we must attempt to follow a

productive rather than a punitive course, one that is flexible and allows room for accommodation and eventual agreement on difficult outstanding issues.

With regard to our assistance programs, we should not allow the increasing complexity of inter-American relations to deter us from continuing to provide substantial economic support to Latin America. I am firmly convinced that while the nature of the aid we proffer must undergo critical analysis and substantial revision, there can be little doubt that such aid, properly conceived and effectively administered, is both needed and desired by prospective Latin American recipients.

I believe that this assistance should concentrate on people-to-people programs wherever possible, particularly those that encourage community cooperation and development.

In addition, there can be no doubt that overseas investments constitute an invaluable asset to developing economies whenever the firms in question are willing to mesh their activities with the legitimate development interests of their Latin American hosts. Therefore, in my view, investments should be encouraged, and the United States should continue to provide encouragement to prospective American investors.

I am convinced that the key to improving inter-American relations and to truly aiding Latin American development lies in understanding the importance of, and practicing consultation and cooperation. We in the United States must continue to listen rather than lecture. It is a practice that involves asking the advice of our neighbors, listening to their concerns, and respecting their priorities.

I believe that the 82d anniversary of Pan American Day marks an important and perhaps critical juncture in hemispheric relations. We have reached a point where it is now possible, with proper understanding and sensitivity on the part of all concerned, to develop and maintain a productive and mature relationship among all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who just addressed us in the well of the House (Mr. MORSE), has just made in his usual manner a very cogent speech on Latin American-United States relations, and an analysis of what he thinks needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure over the many years that I have served in the Congress with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, to observe not only his keen interest in the very vital problems of inter-American relations, but to know that he has left his benchmark on U.S. policy both in legislation and through action to bring the problems of the hemisphere to the attention of the administration, regardless of the political nature of a particular administration. He has in every sense been a leader, and, in the best sense, a leader in terms of formulating and seeking to have implemented foreign policy which is beneficial to the interests of the

United States. I cannot think of a greater accomplishment by any Member of the Congress who serves or seeks to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Suffice it to say the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has had vision; he has had dedication; he has written legislation; he has formulated policy; he has seen to it that it has been implemented; and he has not lost his keen sense of analysis for the future.

So it is with a great deal of pride that I say that my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts and I have served together, and that he has been my strong right arm on the subcommittee. It is with mixed emotions that I see him go on to greater things, as the Under Secretary General of the United Nations, filling the shoes of another great American, Ralph Bunche. I know that he will bring to that new position the same kind of dedication, the same spirit of restless inquiry, the same forward-looking and progressive thinking that has always marked BRAD MORSE's service in the Congress of the United States.

I am sure that all of our colleagues who know about his new position will join me in extending to our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts our best wishes. I know that we will all take pride in being able to say that "we knew him when."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) such time as he may consume.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to echo the tribute which has just been paid to the ranking minority member of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee by our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

In a floor speech earlier this week I referred to the great service that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) has performed in this body. Next Tuesday I will present more extensive remarks on the occasion of a special order which will be taken to pay tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

Mr. Speaker, as the newest member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I am pleased to join my chairman, Mr. FASCELL and my other colleagues in saluting our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere on this Pan American Day.

Our speeches here today again make clear our recognition of the political, legal, economic, and cultural ties which unite us, a recognition that began in 1889 when the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics was established. In the following 83 years, the Bureau has expanded into 23 actively participating nations and has been renamed the Organization of American States with the Pan American Union as its Secretariat.

For the most part, our relations have been characterized by a mutual understanding of each others' problems and a commitment to work out any difficulties among us through negotiations and compromise. Thus, we all can take a great deal of pride in the friendship which we have preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to ignore the disagreements of the past or present. However, I would hope that, as we strive to meet our mutual responsibilities to the peace and development of this hemisphere, we would gain confidence in our ability to deal justly with each other as we recall the successes of the past. Certainly, our work is unfinished, but our commitment is deep. Thus, in the spirit of rededication to our goals, I add my voice to these Pan American Day tributes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN), who is as he says—the newest member of the subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has just stated in a very characteristic way, his open-minded approach to hemispheric problems.

While he is our newest member on the subcommittee, let me say that he has been extremely dedicated and conscientious in attending the committee meetings. He has already set for himself the staggering task of getting caught up on all of the problems—economic, political, and social—of every country in the hemisphere. This is an enormous job but we can see already by his efforts in the subcommittee that he will be a most valuable member. We are very pleased and happy to have him serve with us.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. WHALEN. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind comments and I am looking forward to my service, and active service I might add, on the subcommittee.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this discussion in commemoration of this 82d anniversary of the Organization of American States. All of us in one way or another have many contacts with our neighbors to the south of us.

In recent years I have had a particularly pleasant association with Ambassador Sol Linowitz, and presently with our Ambassador John Juva. Over the years no American has rendered greater service to the OAS and the State Department than Texas' own Thomas Mann.

At a time when we have so many conflicts and irritations and revolutions and battles throughout the world, I think it is significant to observe at this time in the Western Hemisphere the United States enjoys good healthy relationships with our neighbors to the south as well as with Canada. We may have problems and at times it may appear that we have a great deal of conflict. But this is not so. I do not think you can find any more peaceful place in the world than in the Western Hemisphere, and particularly between our country and the group of countries such as the Organization of American States.

So we do have a lot to be proud of. We must remember this and dedicate ourselves to a continuation of this relation-

ship. Those of us who live in Texas are particularly concerned because we are the State that borders the great nation of Mexico, and through Texas, though we are not a republic, but through Texas and Mexico and on to all the nations of the south flow much of the direct contact relationship between this country and all the Organization of American States. So we are mindful of the relationship.

We are cognizant of it and we try our best to be a good neighbor.

In my own city of Austin we have a sister city of Monterrey, Mexico, and we visit two or three times a year in large groups merely to understand the problems we have in each city. They in turn look at what we have in Austin, and as a consequence there is what we hope to be a measurement of understanding of both our city and Mexico. It is good to visit and to keep up communications. If we can do that then, of course, we will never have any serious problems.

We have resolved that our first interest is perhaps, in this instance, to the south with this group of the Organization of American States. It is not that we do not have an interest in other parts of the world, but these are our nearest, dearest, and closest neighbors.

Across the Rio Grande there is a community of spirit and a community of families as well as governments that maintain a strong bond of friendly relationship. May it ever continue. We are mindful of that in our State, and I am proud to join today in support of this resolution on behalf of our friends to the south.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his remarks. He has always had an interest and has displayed great leadership in inter-American relations. Texas, as a border State, through the leadership of its congressional delegation and through others in various agencies of the national administration, has always demonstrated actively the very essence of what good relations are all about. Every major problem has been subjected to negotiation on the basis of good will on both sides.

Although there are still some unresolved problems, even the most difficult of them have lent themselves to resolution because the people in Mexico, and the people in Texas, and throughout the remainder of the United States have had the good will to resolve those disputes and to continue to live as good neighbors, as the gentleman from Texas has said.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Pan American Day we formally note the sense of community we feel with our sister republics in Latin America, the atmosphere of neighborliness which has marked our relations with our friends to the south of us for more than 150 years.

Bound together through geography and history, we and our Latin American neighbors have worked together to keep our hemisphere free of foreign domination and to promote our region's influence in the world community.

It is small wonder that the United States has always been keenly aware of the importance which attaches to our

relations with the nations of Latin America.

It is also appropriate that each year we observe the closeness of that relationship by celebrating Pan American Day.

Our relationship with Latin America, of course, rates more than merely an annual observance. It should be the object of constant efforts toward improvement, a steady push toward a better life for the peoples of this hemisphere.

So it was that one of President Nixon's first acts upon taking office was to send Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on a mission aimed at assessing the needs of 20 Western Hemisphere countries.

As a result of the Rockefeller mission and subsequent report, the President set forth five principles that now shape our relations with the hemisphere: A firm commitment to the Inter-American system and to the compacts binding us in that system; respect for national identity and national dignity; a firm commitment to continued U.S. assistance for hemispheric development; U.S. support for Latin American initiatives on a multilateral basis within the inter-American system; and a dedication to improving the quality of life in the Americas by helping to meet their economic, social, and human needs.

These policy guidelines have been translated into a series of undertakings in trade, development assistance, and science and technology.

But, as the President has said:

We cannot remake continents by ourselves. Such a venture would stifle the initiative and responsibility of other nations and thus their progress and their dignity.

It is not my purpose here to comment at length on the rising tide of nationalism in Latin America or to dwell on such problems as the dominance of military or leftist regimes in certain nations and the sharp increase in violent actions by terrorist and insurgent groups in Uruguay and Brazil. Neither will I go into the maritime boundary disputes with Ecuador and Peru except to state that we must reach agreement on this question.

Many of the existing problems in the hemisphere will give way only slowly to our attempts at solution.

But I feel certain that the general course we are pursuing—the policy based on the five principles previously enunciated—is the right one.

It is clearly in line with the need of our Latin American partners for a more balanced relationship with the United States.

It maintains our commitment to support their development through trade and aid. Yet it recognizes their right to determine their own destiny.

This is the way to improve the quality of life for all our Latin American neighbors.

This is the message I would impart to them on this 82d anniversary of Pan American Day.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in tribute to the oldest international political organization in the world.

From the First International Conference of American States, held in April 1890, a union was established joining the

American people from Cape Horn to the Arctic Circle. Today this union is known as the Organization of American States.

Now in its 82d year, this organization was the first concrete step in the formation of an inter-American system of cooperation and solidarity. We are attempting to work out a common understanding of our shared hopes, desires, and goals. To accomplish this end, the Alliance for Progress was established in 1961 as a pledge of U.S. commitment to Latin American economic and social progress.

We must, as President Kennedy stated:

Convert our good words into good deeds, in a new alliance for progress, to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty.

The Alliance for Progress—a vast cooperative effort to satisfy the needs of all people for homes, work, land, health, and education—ushered in a new era in inter-American relations. This has been an era in which economic, political and social development formed the basis for a unique hemisphere unity. Although sometimes beset by difficulty, we can point to substantial gains in Latin American development which could never have been achieved without the Alliance.

This Pan American Day—April 14, 1972—is a time to recommit ourselves to the principles and goals of the Organization of American States, and the Alliance for Progress.

We must revitalize our policy and emphasize those constructive elements which foster close and healthy Latin American-United States relations.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating the 82d anniversary of the Organization of American States.

I should also like to say a word of welcome to the distinguished cleric who since the initiation of Pan American Day in the House 29 years ago, has offered the opening prayer, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning. Because of his continuing interest in the goal of inter-American solidarity, Father Thorning embodies the spirit of this celebration in the House, and it is a pleasure to welcome him here once again.

Today we mark the founding of one of the world's oldest and greatest international organizations, the Union of American Republics, which is today known as the Organization of American States. From modest beginnings in 1890, the OAS has been joined by a host of governments, organizations, and people who have united together in a common effort to better the lives of millions from Alaska to Cape Horn. What we recognize today is not so much the Organization itself, but the dedication and spirit which have made this possible. We commemorate the ideal or orderly and meaningful change through the political, economic, and social cooperation of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

In celebrating this collective effort, however, we would be less than candid if we did not also recognize the serious conflicts between the United States and the Latin American countries. One need only look at the present OAS Conference to find widespread disenchantment and

disagreement. We find different perspectives on trade, on the economic role of the United States in Latin America, and on the proper political system for achieving national progress.

The Latin America of today is clearly a region of enormous transition. The political and social changes of the Latin American nations occur so rapidly that it is often difficult to keep up with them. Certainly it is difficult to understand their meaning. Despite vast resources, Latin America today remains largely underdeveloped. Only an estimated 40 percent of the population shares in any meaningful way in the economic and social life of the area. The average per capita income remains distressingly low. These problems have been compounded by an unprecedented migration to the cities, most of which are unprepared to handle such an influx. Over 50 percent of Latin Americans now live in urban centers. Many must live in slums, and an extraordinary number are unemployed. The result of these conditions is of course a tremendous social, economic, and political instability, an instability which has unfortunately been heightened by the lack of a consistent, well-considered, and active policy on the part of the United States in this area.

Some 10 years ago, President John F. Kennedy called all the nations of this hemisphere to join in a massive, united effort to erase the poverty and underdevelopment which plague Latin America. The Alliance for Progress was founded to be the vanguard of this effort. It provided initiative and hope, and outlined a progressive role in the development of Latin America in a stable way. Its great and lofty goal was the creation of a hemisphere in which every human being could realize their fullest potential.

Today, the momentum of the Alliance has dissipated. Perhaps the task facing the Alliance was too great, or perhaps we have not tried hard enough. In any case, the Alliance has not fulfilled the expectations of its founders, and at present, the future of inter-American relations face great doubts and uncertainties. U.S. policy toward Latin America remains vague and unsure of itself. There has been no definitive statement outlining U.S. policy in this area, no recent commitment and rededication of the United States as a developed country to assist the underdeveloped countries in their growth. Though it is already 1972, we have not even approached the question, "Where do we go in the 1970's with Latin America?"

It is my hope that the answer to this question will begin right here, with this commemoration of Pan American Day. We can no longer allow the months to slip by while leaving our relationship with Latin America undefined, shaped only from day to day by crises or sudden political developments. The stakes are too high for such drifting. The development of the resources of the Western Hemisphere is an investment in the future. It is a process which can benefit all nations, and it must be done through a cooperative effort.

On this Pan American Day, it is difficult to see into the future of the hemi-

sphere. What is certain, however, is that our pressing problems will not solve themselves. They must be solved through a rededication to the goals which the Pan American Union set for itself 82 years ago. Today, on this 82d Pan American Day, we must all begin that rededication.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly honored to join my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) in this 82d commemoration of the founding of the Pan American Union.

Pan American Day is always a reminder to me of the great progress we have made in hemispherical cooperation, and the even greater challenges which still lie before us. As a resident of south Florida I am still reminded of the tragic consequences of the political upheaval in Cuba, and its effects on the lives of thousands of Cuban refugees still exiled in Florida, but at the same time I am heartened by the progress which many of our Latin American neighbors have made in overcoming the obstacles of unemployment, inflation, and poverty which are prevalent in so much of Latin America. This is certainly an appropriate time to reassess the policies of the past and rededicate ourselves to the fulfillment of the hopes and promises which the future holds.

Mr. Speaker, we live in an ever shrinking world with an ever changing set of priorities. Since we last marked Pan American Day, we have seen the end of a bloody civil war in Pakistan and the subsequent formation of the new nation of Bangladesh. We have witnessed live television broadcasts of an American President in the People's Republic of China, we have witnessed another manned landing on the moon, and we have seen pictures taken by a satellite orbiting Mars. Yet with all this emphasis on events so far away, we have tended to neglect those events taking place as close as 90 miles south of the Florida coast or several hundred yards across the Rio Grande River. Let us not lose sight of the contributions of our fellow members of the Organization of American States but instead take this opportunity to renew our dedication to the goal of making this decade one of international cooperation and friendship within this hemisphere.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the very able and distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States made a request which, I believe, will be impossible to fulfill. Speaking at the opening of the second annual General Assembly of the OAS, Don Galo Plaza reportedly called upon the U.S. Government for a concrete definition of the new U.S. policy toward Latin America. How is it possible to define a policy, old or new, which simply does not exist?

Regardless of the statement of the Secretary of State that there is no part of the world more important to us than Latin America, the actions of our Government have just not supported that claim. It is evident that there is a complete lack of any commitment to any specific course of hemisphere action by this administration. As the very capable chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee aptly observed at the opening of hearings into our Latin

American relations last summer, the administration's activity in regard to hemispheric relations has been a "gigantic shell game" in which realities give way to sporadic rhetoric.

Although the President briefly discussed Latin America in his foreign policy report to the Congress, his remarks lacked any substance. I have yet to see any specific proposals come from the White House and seriously tend to doubt that I will. The plain fact is that there is a complete lack of any commitment on the part of this administration to effectively deal with our relations with our Latin neighbors and to take meaningful initiatives to aid Western Hemisphere nations in achieving healthier, better educated, more productive lives, and in maintaining momentum to secure real social and economic progress.

The United States-Latin American diplomacy has been inept at best and has continually ignored the sensitivities and aspirations of our sister republics. Mr. Nixon told us on several occasions, for example, that "we are prepared to have the kind of relationship with the Chilean Government that it is prepared to have with us." However, his administration has taken almost every occasion to antagonize the Allende regime and seems to have gone out of its way to strain relations with that nation—by prohibiting the visit of a U.S. naval mission, by refusing to assist Chile in negotiating the purchase of three commercial jets, by permitting the comments of official administration spokesmen predicting the end of a government which was freely and openly elected. This certainly does not seem to be a very conciliatory attitude or an atmosphere in which meaningful diplomacy can be conducted. Although only one example, it seems to be indicative of our Government's general disposition toward Latin America.

I believe it is well known that there is a prevailing sentiment in many areas that Washington neither understands nor appreciates what is happening in Latin America. There is a strong feeling in the capitals of the Americas and elsewhere that the United States is insensitive to the needs and ambitions of the Western Hemisphere. As a consequence of this generally senseless diplomacy and lack of commitment, relations with our southern neighbors have deteriorated to their lowest level in many decades. Those lofty goals and principles which underscored the good neighbor policy and the Alliance for Progress have been scrapped and political expediency seems to be the only criteria which is applied to our dealings with Latin nations. As a recent OAS report accurately observed, there is a disaffection in the United States toward foreign assistance programs in Latin America. It is little wonder, therefore, that our Latin neighbors no longer trust us.

It is clear that we must begin to make some basic and very important changes in our present course in Latin America, particularly, if we hope to encourage peaceful change in the hemisphere and to genuinely assist people in their efforts for a better life. The fact is that there is no coherent foreign policy toward Latin

America. The region must be made a top priority within our foreign policy structure. Currently, we react to crises, to kidnappings, to coups and revolts, to expropriations. However, we are not consistently at work putting ourselves into the long and difficult struggle for change and progressive development. Rather, we simply hope to resolve the immediate crisis and secure some short-term political gain. The present "low profile" attitude pursued by the Nixon administration fails to offer the people of Latin America any hope for change or any sense of dedication to the objectives of cooperation with Western Hemisphere nations in improving economies and generally bettering the quality of life for the peoples of the Americas.

The United States must end furnishing military assistance and advice to repressive regimes in Latin America. The policy of furnishing arms and equipment to governments which use them to subjugate their own citizens and to repress basic civil liberties is simply not what this Nation should stand for. The use of U.S. arms and U.S.-trained personnel to continue police-state governments is very real and it is certainly not the kind of action which wins friends for our Government. In addition to suppressing internal dissent, U.S.-purchased military equipment has led to unnecessarily increased tensions and hostilities among nations. There must be a conscious declaration of policy that the furnishing of such military aid will be stopped. This action would also include the withdrawal of our military missions from Latin America. Not only are these military missions costly to maintain but they too have often been used for internal repression and the stifling of basic human rights.

In developing an urgently needed policy for Latin America, the United States must also conduct an in-depth and substantive reassessment of our trade relations. Trade with Western Hemisphere nations must be used as an instrument for authentic development. The fact is that a range of misguided policies seriously hamper our economic assistance. Trade barriers which bar Latin American products from our Nation, the failure to provide for preferential tariffs as promised, the ill-conceived imposition of the import tax, loans which cannot be paid back and only add to the interest burden, grants which simply widen the gap between rich and poor, dominance of the United States in Latin American economies—all of these are sources of grave difficulty and tensions and represent factors which seriously exacerbate our already strained relations. Certainly effective trade policies can encourage real economic development and social reform and affirmative action must be taken toward this end without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, the executive branch of the Government cannot be held totally accountable for the lack of any commitment and policy toward Latin America. Frankly, I believe it is rather hypocritical for us to be observing Pan American Day and the 82d anniversary of the founding of the Organization of American States this afternoon when the Congress

has failed to demonstrate any real concern for our sister republics of the Americas. Aside from almost failing to fund the important programs conducted by the Inter-American Development Bank, the Congress imposed the stipulation that the U.S. IDB Governor take negative action against the loan request of a nation which may have expropriated U.S. property or violated contracts with U.S. citizens and had not yet made arrangements for compensation. As I predicted when we considered this ill-conceived restriction in February, it has been misunderstood by our Latin neighbors. It is deeply resented by them and has certainly added an unnecessary pressure on already problematic relations. This congressional action established a precondition for negotiation and, in terms of Latin American politics, it will make it most difficult for those who are trying to move their country forward to operate with U.S. help and to form any meaningful partnership with us.

This proviso, in addition to the Hickenlooper and Pelly amendments, intimidate Latin American nations and hang like the Sword of Damocles over international arbitration efforts and bilateral negotiations. As the OAS report accurately noted, these trends inhibit Latin America's economic and social development. If we are going to attempt to move our sister republics toward developing economies we cannot at the same time impose these political requirements on them. These devices must be removed at the earliest possible date.

The establishment of the Pan American Union—then known as the Union of American Republics—82 years ago first gave formal structure to the steadily growing fabric of relationships which have bound the Americas since the days when we shared common struggles against colonial rule. Unfortunately, however, we have allowed this historic relationship to deteriorate and wither. We have failed to offer a clear, concise, and stable conception of what is to be the overall strategy of U.S. cooperation with Latin America. We are now viewed in many sectors of Latin America with resentment, fear, suspicion, and general distrust.

I believe, however, there is still time to take some positive action to rescue our relations with Latin America and to develop a sound and progressive policy for the hemisphere. Such a policy must be as consistent as possible with the real interests of the people of Latin America, not with a favored few or a repressive government or with our own short-term political, military, or business interests. We can devote such resources and efforts as we have to the work of helping the people of the Americas build better lives for themselves. This policy must offer hope and encouragement for positive change and must be free from the shackles of past prejudices and attitudes. We have both a moral and legal obligation to aid Latin America in achieving economic and social progress and to work with them in a partnership to extend education and health programs, develop sound institutions, and to generally aid them in peacefully fulfilling those hopes

and aspirations which this country has encouraged in the hemisphere, in this vast area of rising expectations. We must not ignore this obligation—either the Executive or the Congress—and we should give meaning to our commitments by actively supporting programs for Latin America and by becoming more aware and sensitive to their needs and hopes. Once we are on the road toward achieving this end and have cast aside the paternalistic approach of aiding our Latin neighbors we can then more appropriately observe Pan American Day.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 82d anniversary of the founding of the inter-American system. Its purpose is to call upon all of us in the hemisphere community to pause and reflect upon the political, legal, economic, and cultural ties which unite the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Historically, our hemispheric union took shape as an association of free republics joining together against interference and domination from powerful nations across the ocean. Through the years, our similar geographies, histories, common heritage of self-government, and shared interests have molded us into a sense of community of special durability—a sense which we have embodied in the institutions and instruments of the inter-American system which we know today. Pan American Day is also a time for leaders and makers of policy in the United States and our sister hemisphere nations to pause to assess our hemisphere partnership and to reflect upon its future direction.

In this fast-moving decade of the 1970's, hemisphere cohesion is being put to the test by rapid and often turbulent change in Latin America. Latin America today is a troubled region; each nation is striving to formulate a new national conscience in step with 20th century realities and is undergoing intense growing pains. This change today is reflected in: The emergence of new ideologies and political movements, shifting patterns of political and economic power, a new diversity of political systems, rapidly accelerating expectations by the Latin American masses, a new and intense sense of nationalism, and an expanded view by each nation of its role in the world community. The dominating imperative of all of the Latin American governments, regardless of their political complexions, is an intense involvement with modernization and with reform—the formulation of viable methods for the political, economic, and social development of their peoples.

As part of the process of growth and maturity, the Latin American nations are demanding of the United States a changed hemisphere relationship, based upon their individual capacity to determine their own destinies. During the rest of this century, at least, the rapid rate of political, economic, and social flux in Latin America can be expected to pose problems for the United States-Latin American relationship and, in recent years especially, it has been the great challenge of U.S. policymakers to transform outmoded approaches, that our Nation might respond constructively to

Latin America's changing environment and lay a basis for a more mature political relationship with our neighbors in the hemisphere.

In formulating U.S. policy today we are cognizant of several basic premises: First, that geography, history, and U.S. interests give our relationship with Latin America a special and continuing importance; second, that nations increasingly assertive of national and regional identities will necessarily express themselves in terms of differentiation from the United States; and third, that nations vigorously mobilizing themselves for development would and should be less dependent on U.S. prescriptions.

In recent years, our Nation has attempted to gear itself toward a more mature partnership with our hemisphere neighbors, based on a more balanced relationship, shared responsibilities and initiatives in hemisphere collaboration within the inter-American community, respect for the full sovereign equality of each, a mature U.S. response to political diversity, and a continuing commitment on our part to support social, political, and economic development within the hemisphere. Although the forms of our cooperation are changing to meet the needs of a dynamic hemisphere, the level of our commitment and our strength of purpose must remain high.

In considering the future course of our relationship with the other nations that share our hemisphere, we must be cognizant of the problems outstanding between us and our neighbors; we must listen with open mind to their expressions of dissatisfaction with the relationship; and we must enter into an open dialog with them in endeavoring to forge a sound future policy.

Foremost among issues at variance between Latin America and the United States are those concerning the Latin American nations' expectations and desires in areas of U.S. trade and development assistance, and the inability of the United States to meet commitments in these areas. The notion has spread in Latin America that the United States is uninterested and neglectful of the hemisphere.

In the area of trade, a central issue at odds between us, the Latin American nations have strongly encouraged the United States to assist them in expanding their trade with our Nation, export earnings being the most crucial source of financing for internal development. Basically, the Latin governments maintain that the critical development needs of their region entitle them to more favorable trade concessions from the developed world than have been afforded them in the past. The other less developed regions, they argue, have achieved some form of liberalized trade concessions from European nations, and the United States, as their closest developed neighbor, should respond to their needs in this area. They have requested that we relax tariffs, quotas, and other import barriers and, in concert with the other developed nations, institute a global system of preferential tariffs for the products of developing nations.

The United States, for its part, has

taken steps to provide market access for Latin American exports such as sugar, coffee, meat, and other primary commodities. Although our Government has committed itself to markedly increasing opportunities for Latin exports to this country, U.S. moves in this direction will be limited by our adverse trade balances and by other economic problems facing our country.

A second major issue of conflict concerns Latin American apprehension over the continued commitment of the United States to provide development assistance to the region. The seeming reticence of the United States to approve funds for Latin American development projects has been received by many Latin nations as evidence of a diminished U.S. commitment to their future. It is true, however, that the United States does remain committed to development assistance in Latin America, particularly in the priority areas of the Alliance for Progress—education, agriculture and land reform, health, unemployment, urban development, and threats to the environment. The United States has maintained an average annual level of development assistance commensurate with the first 10 years of the Alliance for Progress. Much has been accomplished through this program, but challenges to development programs arise every day, and the Latin American nations desire a firm and continuing commitment from us that their development efforts will be assisted. A conflict has arisen here, because of the increasing strength of the view in the United States that our domestic problems have become so severe that our first priority in allocation of funds should be to remedy our own societal problems.

A third hemisphere problem in the economic sphere is that of the role of U.S. private investment in Latin America. The Latin nations' growing sense of economic nationalism and desire to control their basic resources has led to nationalization and expropriation of U.S. private properties. The Latin American nations themselves still seem to be uncertain over the proper role for foreign private investment in their countries. The U.S. Government is currently grappling with what seems to be a growing trend toward expropriation of U.S. private investment coupled without proper indemnification of the companies involved.

The question of how our Nation should deal with these trends is perhaps the most sensitive issue we face in the hemisphere. Certainly there is a sense of immediacy in achieving a compromise between the need to protect the investments of U.S. citizens and to insure that such investments are in harmony with the development goals of Latin American countries.

As we look to the future, there is much to ponder. The United States, for its part, cannot be indifferent to the hemisphere in which it lives. Our association will thrive only if our common purposes do. We cannot deny that the maintenance of a continuing and close relationship is of as great benefit and necessity to us as it is to our Latin neighbors. We and our neighbors must realize that the ongoing confrontation with the complex and im-

mense challenges of development will continue for the foreseeable future, and is certain to require a sustained determination and accelerated effort from all of us.

We are cognizant of the reality that a hemisphere divided by a yawning gulf between wealth and squalor is no community. Our commitment must be to assist our neighbors with all the resources we can command to achieve their own objectives of economic, social, and political betterment and an upgrading of the quality of life in the region. It must be a commitment not only to Latin American governments and institutions, but to the people themselves, people with whom we have traditionally maintained warmest feelings and close human ties.

At the first session of the recently created OAS general assembly, meeting in Costa Rica in April 1971, Secretary of State Rogers communicated a message from the United States reaffirming and underscoring the strength of the U.S. commitment to the inter-American system and to the compacts that bind us within that system. At the same time, Secretary Rogers set forth anew our readiness to play a useful and constructive role in the continuing struggle of our hemisphere neighbors to secure a life of greater quality for their peoples.

On this Pan American Day, as we look toward the future, we are aware of the difficulties to come—as the decade unfolds, our hemisphere relationship will be subject to strains and disappointments, to tests of our and our neighbors' compassion, tolerance, and maturity. On this day let us rededicate ourselves to weathering the upheavals and successfully meeting the challenges which this decade has imposed upon our hemisphere system.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 10, 1972, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8787. An act to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 924), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 924

Resolved, That Ogden R. Reid, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-280)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, I have the honor to transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Office of Economic Opportunity for Fiscal Year 1971.

RICHARD NIXON.

The WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1972.

THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-281)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress this Fourth Annual Report of the National Science Board, "The Role of Engineers and Scientists in a National Policy for Technology." This Report has been prepared in accordance with Section 4 (g) of the National Science Foundation Act, as amended by Public Law 90-407.

Many of the key recommendations in this Report are in close accord with the initiatives I have set forth this year in my address on the State of the Union, my Budget Message, and my recent message to the Congress on science and technology.

The Report stresses that in the field of research and development, a vigorous partnership between private industry, the universities, and the Government can be an important asset for strengthening our economy and spurring new technological solutions to problems of the modern world. The Report also points out that intensive research is needed to refine our understanding of the complexities of contemporary life and to develop better ways of bringing our talents to bear on domestic concerns.

As I have indicated on several occasions, I have great hope that we can realize the full potential of American

technology for serving our national purposes. The commitment of this Administration to continued progress toward that goal is clearly reflected in the array of programs which I have detailed in my latest Budget Message.

I am confident that the Congress will find this Report useful.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 13, 1972.

AIR POLLUTION

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, air pollution in the city of Washington has been reduced in several key aspects. Following the enactment of the District of Columbia Clean Air Act, which I sponsored, sulfur has dropped from 257 micrograms per cubic meter of air in 1968 to a reading of 110 micrograms this past January. Dirt in the air has dropped from 105 particles per cubic meter in 1968 to 80 particles in 1971.

Pollution from cars, particularly carbon monoxide, remains a serious problem, but the tax on parked cars proposed by some members of the District of Columbia City Council would be counter-productive. We need more positive measures. I have stressed before that there is need for auto inspections that emphasize the repair of defective exhaust systems and the continued efficiency of the antipollution devices in the newer cars.

The subway system and the improvements to be planned in area bus services under a new \$3.1 million Federal grant should also help reduce pollution. And there will be further improvements as more old cars find their ways to graveyards and are replaced by new cars meeting stricter Federal standards.

But a tax on parked cars would be self-defeating. Without good alternatives for those who travel to the city to shop and work, this proposal would decrease pollution only to the degree it destroyed downtown business. The District of Columbia City Council's proposal for a tax only on all-day parking in private garages, if it did reduce the numbers of cars parked all day, would free these parking spaces for more people to bring more cars down for a short period of time. This could actually increase pollution.

Meanwhile, the same City Council has voted to cut funds for the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, which operates and guards the fringe parking lots that encourage drivers to leave their cars on the outskirts of town and take the bus the rest of the way into town. These fringe lots accommodated 387,000 cars in a recent year—and reduced pollution downtown to that extent.

Unless some other District of Columbia agency takes on the job of providing these guards, motorists may fear their car will be vandalized or their persons injured. They may skip the fringe lots, drive downtown and add to pollution levels there.

When taken together, these actions do

not appear to stem so much from an interest in reducing pollution as from an interest in making things tough for the man or woman who has business downtown—and thus contributes to its economic health.

The parking tax does not reduce the limousines or other vehicles used by the City Council and the District of Columbia government. Nor does it reduce the government's parking provided for some lucky District of Columbia employees.

The proposal has been poorly thought out and should be abandoned.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained with constituents on April 11 during rollcall No. 105, regarding H.R. 13188, the Coast Guard authorization bill. If I had been present I would have voted "yea."

SIXTY-FIVE DAYS, AND STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has continued to ignore Ways and Means Committee Chairman MILLS' February 7 request for proposals from the President on tax reform. But there are a few signs that the logjam may be breaking up. The Wall Street Journal reported last week that "Richard Nixon is reluctantly considering climbing aboard the tax reform bandwagon." The article goes on to say, however, that the administration has no plans to push for tax reform in this session of Congress. Nevertheless, the article says, if the "furor" over taxes continues, administration sources "envision Mr. Nixon coming up with just enough generalities about sweeping revision to smudge the Democratic label on the issue."

I am glad that the administration is at least beginning to think about the politics of tax reform. That is a start anyway.

But it is not enough—not enough for those of us in the House who want to see something substantive from the President on tax reform before the next vote on raising the debt ceiling in June, and not enough for the taxpayers who have been writing me in recent weeks and months to express their concern and anger over the inequities in our tax system.

I was especially impressed by one such letter from a gentleman in Wisconsin. Despite a total family income for 1971 "well into the five figures" he reports that he was able to find enough "deductions, exemptions, and exclusions" to reduce his taxable income to zero. It took him 3 whole working days to do it, but he did it.

Remarkably enough, though, he says he found this result "absolutely appalling," and promptly sent off a contribution to the National Committee for an Effective Congress to be used to support candidates who will work to eliminate the kind of tax loopholes that allow him and others to escape taxation.

We need more people in this country like Ronald Wyllys. I include his letter in the RECORD at this point:

MADISON, WIS.,
April 3, 1972.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: Your "Congressional Report," vol. 21, no. 1 (March 1972) arrived most opportunely today. Your appeal for funds for tax-reform-supporting candidates prompts the enclosed \$25 contribution, the largest single one of many contributions we have made to NCEC over the years.

Except for basic issues of civil liberties, I consider no current political issue to be more important than tax reform. I say this with a personal tax experience vividly in mind. I devoted this past Easter weekend entirely to preparing our Federal and Wisconsin income-tax returns, spending the entirely excessive amount of time of at least three full working days (24 man-hours) at the task. With a total family income well into the five figures in 1971, I was able to find enough deductions, exemptions, and exclusions to wind up with a taxable income of \$0.00 for our Federal return.

From the selfish, personal standpoint I am, of course, delighted with this result. But as an example of the way the present income-tax laws operate—and we do not even have such well-known tax gimmicks as oil income, real-estate depreciation, or municipal bonds working for us—I find this result absolutely appalling. It is as unfair for us to pay no 1971 income tax to the Federal Government as it was for the 112 millionaires who paid no 1970 income tax. As you point out, tax reform is indeed "fundamentally . . . a moral question." And yet, the Nixon Administration would like to add to its immoralities by enacting the blatantly regressive value-added tax.

I hope you will use our contribution to support candidates who will oppose the value-added tax and will strive for:

1. elimination of all income-tax deductions except those for state and local income taxes and (till a decent program of tax-supported medical care is achieved) extraordinary medical expenses
2. reduction of personal exemptions, and elimination of exemptions for more than two children per family (we have four children)
3. elimination of all exclusions of income from taxability
4. sharply progressive income-tax rates.

Sincerely,

RONALD E. WYLLYS.

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 several of us made statements in the House in support of constructive alternatives to the rigid restrictions on trade and investment which have been proposed as a solution to our economic and trade problems.

During my own statement on this subject, beginning on page 9466 of the RECORD, I mentioned a number of findings of recent studies, including ones which describe the operations of multinational corporations and their contributions to the U.S. economy.

Since my statement, representatives of the AFL-CIO have contacted me about their challenge to the validity of one of these studies on multinationals, the Department of Commerce study, "Policy

Aspects of Foreign Investment by U.S. Multinational Corporations," and have asked me to insert in the RECORD information on this challenge.

Accordingly, I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of George Meany's letter to Secretary of Commerce Peter G. Peterson on the report and the AFL-CIO press release which was issued at that time.

I expect to receive a copy of Secretary Peterson's reply to Mr. Meany's letter. In keeping with my goal of developing better information to help us make prudent decisions on issues relating to trade and our economic welfare, I will also insert Secretary Peterson's reply in the RECORD when I receive it.

The material follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, D.C., March 20, 1972.

HON. PETER G. PETERSON,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY PETERSON: A commerce Department report, "Policy Aspects of Foreign Investment by Multinational Firms," misrepresents AFL-CIO views on international trade and investment. The report even presents an unfair analysis of employment figures to conclude that "an examination of the relevant data . . . does not bear out labor's contention that overseas investment operations result in declining employment." I urge you to correct the public record.

The AFL-CIO has asked for modernization of U.S. trade, tax, investment and related international policies, because the world has changed and jobs of millions of Americans are now adversely affected. The AFL-CIO also supports the Burke-Hartke bill, H.R. 10914 and S. 2592, legislation designed to modernize U.S. laws on international trade, taxes and related issues. The Commerce Department report emphasizes only multinational firms with misleading analysis.

Unemployment is a serious problem in the United States. The AFL-CIO has stated that complex changes, including the operations of multinational firms, increase that unemployment. Any fair examination even of the employment figures used in the report as "relevant data" shows that the analysis is distorted:

For employment figures, the Commerce Department selected 14 industries "which include the largest overseas investors" to suggest the multinational firms' relationship to employment.

Employment gains of 11 industries with rising employment are said to be "nearly equal" to total U.S. employment gains between 1965 and 1970. A fair analysis would show that total U.S. employment rose 2½ times faster than employment in the 14 industries selected. The reason for the difference is that the report's analysis included only 11 industries with rising employment in its comparison with total employment rises of all U.S. industries. In other words, the analysis omitted three industries with declining employment of the total 14 selected in a comparison with total employment gains of all industries. All 14 industries—those with declining and rising employment—showed a 7% employment increase, and all U.S. industries—those with declining and rising employment—showed a 17% employment increase. A fair analysis would have made that comparison instead of omitting three industries with declining employment and comparing 11 out of the 14 with all U.S. industries to show that the employment gains were "nearly equal."

The three industries with declining employment accounted for 44% of the 14 in-

dustries' employment in 1965. The analysis does not mention this relationship and thus omits half of the iceberg. These three industries showed a decline of over 80,000 jobs in the five-year period. By 1970, their share of employment fell to 39%.

The 14 industries' share of total U.S. employment dropped from 6.2% in 1965 to 5.6% in 1970. The analysis does not mention this fact.

The employment figures used for the 14 industries selected are for all workers in those industries, not just employees of multinational firms. Thus the figures do not even reflect the employment trends of firms with overseas investment or employment trends of multinational firms which have production in those industries. If BLS data on all U.S. industries were used to compare those industries with rising employment and the 11 industries with rising employment the percentages would be 21% and 16% between 1965 and 1970.

Therefore, the analysis is biased and the conclusion is false.

In the interest of accurate public information, I urge you to correct the public record.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEANY, President.

NEWS FROM THE AFL-CIO

AFL-CIO President George Meany today charged the Department of Commerce with utilizing distorted data, omissions and biased analyses in an attempt to refute organized labor's charge that American multinational firms are contributing to unemployment in the U.S.

Meany said that a recent Commerce Department report not only misrepresented AFL-CIO views on international trade and investment but its "relevant data" deliberately sought to give an impression of job gains by omitting multinational industries where employment has fallen.

Instead of employment gains "nearly equal" to all of U.S. industry, as the report contends, Meany declared that U.S. multinational corporations are lagging far behind the remainder of the U.S. in job-creation. "A fair analysis would show that total U.S. employment rose 2½ times faster than employment in the 14 industries selected" in the Commerce report on multinational firms, Meany stated.

Meany called upon Commerce Secretary Peter G. Peterson "in the interest of accurate public information"—to correct the report's distortions and its conclusion that "relevant data . . . does not bear out labor's contention that overseas investment operations result in declining employment."

The Federation president said that organized labor has asked for legislation to modernize U.S. trade, tax investment programs "because the world has changed and jobs of millions of Americans are now adversely affected." The Commerce report—seen as a reply to labor's legislative aims—dealt only with the activities of 14 selected U.S. industries having the largest overseas investments.

According to Meany, when the report data sought to show the job relationship between the multinational firms and U.S. firms as a whole, it used only the 11 industries that showed employment gains and omitted the three industries with declining employment. The three omitted industries, Meany said, accounted for 44% of the 14 industries employment in 1965. The report thus "omits half of the iceberg," Meany noted.

Further evidence of the report's bias, Meany said, was the failure of the analysis to report that the 14 selected industries have dropped in their share of U.S. employment from 6.2% in 1965 to 5.6% in 1970. "The analysis is biased and the conclusion is false," Meany concluded.

TRANSMITTAL OF INTERNATIONAL
EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS TO
CONGRESS

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which would require that international agreements other than treaties which are entered into by the United States must be transmitted to the Congress within 60 days after their execution.

This bill is identical to a measure which was passed by the other body on February 16 by a vote of 81 to 0 as S. 596. S. 596 currently is pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I am introducing this companion measure today as a means of indicating that the proposal has support in the House of Representatives.

At the present time in the other body a "great debate" is being waged over a war powers act. As a sponsor of the war powers legislation passed by the House last August, House Joint Resolution 1, I have been following the debate with considerable interest.

My conclusions have been that although the Senate war powers bill is unwise and probably unconstitutional, there is strong support in the Congress for prudent and temperate legislation designed to reassert congressional authority and responsibilities in international affairs.

House Joint Resolution 1 is such a bill and so is the legislation which I am introducing today.

This bill requires that the Secretary of State transmit to Congress the text of any international agreement, other than a treaty, to which the United States is a party at least 60 days after such an agreement has entered into force.

Any such agreement whose immediate public exposure would, in the opinion of the President, injure the national security, would not be transmitted publicly to the whole Congress but would be sent to the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and Senate.

The texts would be kept by those committees "under an appropriate injunction of secrecy" which could be removed only by the President.

This bill was motivated by recent disclosures that certain executive agreements had been entered into by the executive branch without the awareness of Congress or its committees. Countries with which these agreements were made include Ethiopia, Laos, Thailand, and Korea.

While it is apparent that some executive agreements must be kept secret for security reasons, I believe that at the very least, the two Foreign Affairs Committees should be kept fully informed since such agreements logically could require subsequent congressional action.

During Senate hearings on this proposal, executive branch witnesses agreed with the general proposition that the Congress has not, in the past, been kept adequately informed about some international agreements entered into by the United States. They testified that some

remedy is needed. On the other hand, they opposed legislating the remedy, preferring that the Department and the two committees work out an informal procedure through "cooperation and accommodation" for reporting such agreements.

It was indicated that the executive branch would retain the option to withhold the actual texts of agreement while briefing appropriate Members on the contents.

In my judgment such informal arrangements would be weighted heavily in favor of the executive branch which would still retain the power to disclose or not to disclose. Moreover, working on a case-by-case basis could easily result in continuing friction and irritation between our two branches of government.

This bill would provide a much more effective remedy to what all are agreed is an improper situation. For that reason it is my hope that this proposal can be expeditiously approved by the House and enacted into law.

The text of the legislation follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 112a the following new section:

"112b. United States international agreements; transmission to Congress
"The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Congress the text of any international agreement, other than a treaty, to which the United States is a party as soon as practicable after such agreement has entered into force with respect to the United States but in no event later than sixty days thereafter. However, any such agreement the immediate public disclosure of which would, in the opinion of the President, be prejudicial to the national security of the United States shall not be so transmitted to the Congress but shall be transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives under an appropriate injunction of secrecy to be removed only upon due notice from the President."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 2 of title 1, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately between items 112a and 113 the following:

"112b. United States international agreements; transmission to Congress."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. GRIFFITHS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Wednesday, April 12 and Thursday, April 13, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ABOUREZEK, for 60 minutes, on April 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROUSSELOT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. ASHBROOK in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. MORSE in three instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. DOW in three instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in three instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in four instances.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.

Mr. BENNETT in three instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in three instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. DULSKI in six instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS in three instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1338. An act to authorize the government of the District of Columbia to fix certain fees; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1363. An act to revise and modernize procedures relating to licensing by the District of Columbia of persons engaged in certain occupations, professions, businesses, trades, and callings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1819. An act to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to provide for minimum Federal payments after July 1, 1972, for relocation assistance made available under federally assisted programs and for an extension of the effective date of the act; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2209. An act relating to crime and law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED
TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 12, 1972 present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 563. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1972, as "National Arbor Day";

H.J. Res. 687. A joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; and

H.J. Res. 1095. A joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1972 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month."

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table, and referred as follows:

1854. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 3, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on north shore of Long Island, Suffolk County, N.Y. in response to resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 20, 1963 and June 19, 1963, respectively, and also in partial response to Public Law 71, 84th Congress, first session, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 92-198); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 4, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Texas City Channel, Tex. (industrial canal), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 23, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 92-199); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1856. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 4, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Hoonah Harbor, Alaska, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 21 and May 19, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 92-200); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1857. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certification that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Oahe Unit, James Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin program, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 83-172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1858. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with the University of Idaho College of Mines for a research project entitled "Solutions to Problems of Pollution Associated with Mining in Northern Idaho," pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1859. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a

draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to Commissioners and Commission employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1860. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report that the payment limitation under the 1971 cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs, administered by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for the Commodity Credit Corporation, had limited effect on reducing expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1462. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 92-984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11774. A bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system in order to preserve and interpret the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 92-985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11839. A bill to amend the act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91-660; 84 Stat. 1967), an act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 92-986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14015. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), section 8c(6)(I), and section 8(c)(7)(C) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (Rept. 92-987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 900. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation (Rept. No. 92-988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 14348. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 14349. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain homeowner mortgage interest paid by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on behalf of a low-income mortgagor shall not be deductible by such mortgagor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 14352. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14353. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. Dow):

H.R. 14354. A bill to establish a commission to investigate and study the practice of clear-cutting of timber resources of the United States on Federal lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 14355. A bill to continue for an additional year at current levels the authorization of appropriations for carrying out higher education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14356. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research with respect to the causes of sudden death syndrome, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 14357. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business, or any business having 25 or less employees, in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses, from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRAY, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. GROVER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. STUBBLEFIELD):

H.R. 14358. A bill to amend section 8335 of title 5, United States Code, to reduce the mandatory retirement age for non-U.S. citizen employees of the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government employed on the Isthmus of Panama to 62 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEYSER:

H.R. 14359. A bill to provide that foreign made products be labeled to show the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 14360. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. DOW, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 14361. A bill to provide military assistance to Israel in order to assist in the resettlement of Russian refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 14362. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States in order to increase the duty on shelled filberts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 14363. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 14364. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows, subject to \$3,000 and \$4,200 annual income limitations; to provide for such veterans a certain priority in entitlement to hospitalization and medical

care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 14365. A bill to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Congress within 60 days after the execution thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 1160. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.J. Res. 1161. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY of New York (for himself, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. STRATTON):
H. Res. 925. Resolution calling for peace

in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14366. A bill for the relief of Chrissa K. Kouthouridou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14367. A bill for the relief of Tin Kwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 14368. A bill for the relief of the AIRCO Cryopants Corp. (formerly AIRCO/BOC Cryogenic Plants Corp.), a subsidiary of AIRCO, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, April 13, 1972

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1972)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, be near to all who serve this Nation in this place. In their labors strengthen them, in weariness renew them, in discouragement hearten them, in monotony refresh them, and in all their efforts inspire them. Give them the inner compensation of lives lived in public service and the peace which comes from doing their best. Be in their homes to make them sanctuaries of love. Be especially with those who mourn this day, that they may be comforted by Thy continual presence.

We pray in Thy holy name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STEVENSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. The Senator will suspend to receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 169) to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 13336. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations; and

H.J. Res. 1029. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May of 1972 as "National Arthritis Month."

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 13336. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.J. Res. 1029. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May of 1972 as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. What is the pending business, and is there any other business that should come before it?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate recessed last night until today, so it is in the same legislative day. The Journal will first be approved, then the Chair will proceed to ask whether the leadership desires recognition, and then the Senate will proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Chair.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 12, 1972, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the acting minority leader seek recognition?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, Mr. President, I do not.

WAR POWERS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. 2956, to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress.